



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,581	08/19/2003	Laurie H. Glimcher	HUI-041DV	3956
959	7590	07/26/2006	EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD 28 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109				LI, QIAN JANICE
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1633		

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/643,581	GLIMCHER ET AL.
	Examiner Q. Janice Li, M.D.	Art Unit 1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claims 1, 4, 5, is acknowledged.

Upon review of applicant's traversal, search and reconsideration, group II will be rejoined with group I.

Claims 1-13 are pending, however, claims 6-13 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Claims 1-5 are under current examination.

### ***Priority***

This application is a divisional application of U.S. patent application 09/753,346, now U.S. patent 6,632,608. The status of the '346 application should be updated in the first sentence of instant specification.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed 6/14/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

C16 through C20 of the information disclosure statement filed 6/14/2006 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the publication date for these references is missing.

Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The factors to be considered when determining whether the disclosure satisfies the enablement requirements and whether undue experimentation would be required to make and use the claimed invention are summarized in *In re Wands*, (858 F2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ 2d 1400, 1404, (Fed Cir.1988)). These factors include but are not limited to the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in the

art, the predictability of the art, the breadth of the claims, and amount of direction provided. The factors most relevant to this rejection are the nature of the claims, and whether sufficient amount of direction or guidance are provided in the specification to enable one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to identifying a compound that "modulates" hepatocyte growth or plasma cell differentiation or T cell subset activity in "XBP-1 deficient" hepatocytes, B cells, or T cells, respectively. The method steps comprise contacting the XBP-1 deficient cells with a test compound, and determining the ability or effect of the test compound on the relevant parameters, i.e. hepatocyte growth or plasma cell differentiation or Th2 cytokine production. The usefulness of the invention is apparent in the hope of finding therapeutic compounds that would remedy the XBP-1 deficiency related cellular dysfunction.

As an initial matter, the only XBP-1 deficient hepatocytes taught in the specification were obtained from the *embryos* of the XBP-1 gene knockout mice (XBP-1<sup>-/-</sup>) because XBP-1 gene knockout is lethal and the embryo would not survive to mature; and the only XBP-1 deficient lymphocytes (T/B cells) were obtained from XBP-1<sup>-/-</sup> /RAG-2 chimeric mice, made by injecting mouse XBP-1<sup>-/-</sup> ES cells to RAG-2 blastocyst, and through a mechanism called RAG-2-deficient blastocyst complementation. The specification does not provide sufficient guidance for any other means of obtaining XBP-1 deficient cells.

Secondly, Claims as written encompass cells from any animal species, however, only XBP-1 deficient mice were readily available. Obtaining XBP-1 deficient animal in

other mammalian species is significantly limited by the lacking ES cells in animals beyond mouse, and the RAG-2 animal, needed to produce XBP-1 deficient lymphocytes, is only available in the mouse species.

Thirdly, although not explicitly indicated, the use of the XBP-1 deficient cells implies or mandates any compound that regulates the function of these cells must be capable of supplementing the function of XBP-1 because any dysfunction in these cells are caused by the missing XBP-1 gene, and thus "modulating" the function of these cells requires providing the function of XBP-1 gene. To this end, it is noted other than the XBP-1 gene itself, the specification fails to teach and one cannot envision what other compounds may substitute or supplement the XBP-1 gene. For example, such compound is apparently not present in the body of a mouse since the XBP-1 deficiency bring to a halt the embryo development of the mouse, and lethal. The specification fails to provide sufficient guidance as to what type of compound(s) one should look for as a possible candidate to modulate XBP-1 deficiency, and the skilled intending to practice the invention will be sent to an extensive hunting journey.

Moreover, the term "modulation" encompasses both suppression and stimulation. However, according to the teaching of the specification the XBP-1 deficient hepatocytes are poorly developed, and dying, it is hard to imagine that their growth could be further down-regulated. It appears that the specification fails to provide sufficient guidance to support the full scope of the claimed invention.

In view of the analysis *supra*, the claimed invention does not appear to be enabled for the intended use, i.e. finding compounds that remedy the XBP-1 deficiency.

Therefore, in view of the limited guidance, the lack of predictability of the art and the breadth of the claims, one skill in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation as it is broadly claimed.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 28 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/655,620. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they overlap in scopes.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

It is noted multiple applications filed by applicant are co-pending. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant

contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

***Conclusion***

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Q. Janice Li** whose telephone number is 571-272-0730. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, except every other Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Dave T. Nguyen** can be reached on 571-272-0731. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of formal matters can be directed to the patent analyst, **William Phillips**, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0548.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance.

Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is **(866) 217-9197**. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at **800-786-9199**.

**Q. JANICE LI, M.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**



Q. Janice Li, M.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1633

*QJL*  
July 24, 2006